



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/895,751	06/28/2001	Arvind Prabhakar	P5935	1048

7590 02/27/2006

Wagner Murabito & Hao LLP
Two North Market Street Third /Floor
San Jose, CA 95113

EXAMINER

SHORTLEDGE, THOMAS E

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2654

DATE MAILED: 02/27/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.		Applicant(s)	
	09/895,751		PRABHAKAR ET AL.	
	Examiner		Art Unit	
	Thomas E. Shortledge		2654	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 November 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6, 8-15, 17-24, 26-28, 30-35, 37-42 and 44-48 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6, 8-15, 17-24, 26-28, 30-35, 37-42 and 44-48 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This communication is in response to Remarks filed 11/28/2005.
2. Claims 1-6, 8-15, 17-24, 26-28, 30-35, 37-42 and 44-48 are pending. Claims 1, 10, 19, 28, 35 and 42 are independent. Claims 1, 5, 10-15, 17-19, 23, 28, 35, and 37-41 have been amended.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments filed 11/28/2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The applicants' argues that Lakritz does not describe anything about a translation of a localizable string including a user-supplied translation and that Lakritz does not describe prompting a user for confirmation of the identifying of a localizable string. However, the examiner argues that that Lakritz teaches the user is able to input text to the translated the webpage, and further, a user is able to create user-defined term databases, where the user is able to select or supply the translation to be used for the selected languages (col. 28, lines 24-34 and 63-67 and col. 29, lines 1-30).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

Art Unit: 2654

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

5. Claims 1-6, 8-15, 17-24, 26-28, 30-35, 37-42 and 44-48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Lakritz (6,623,529).

As to claims 1 and 10, Lakritz teaches:

a markup language document (HTML content, col. 7, line 19);

identifying a localizable string within said token (col. 7, lines 27-29)

creating a file including a translation of at least one said localizable string

(separating country or regional content from the structure of the document into a separate file, where that file can be updated, col. 7, lines 12-18);

wherein said translation includes a user-supplied translation (creating user-defined term databases, where the user is able to supply the translations to be used, col. 28, lines 24-34 and 63-67 and col. 29, lines 1-30);

creating a second file including non-localized data from said document

(separating out the country or regional content into a separate file, leaving the other content in a separate file, col. 7, lines 12-18); and

merging said first file and said second file (finding the correct localization file, and putting the files back together, col. 7, lines 18-20).

As to claim 19, Lakritz teaches:

a processor (a computer, col. 3, lines 25, which would necessarily include a processor);

a memory storing program instructions (a computer with applications, col. 3, lines 25, which would necessarily include a memory);

identifying a localizable string within said token (col. 7, lines 27-29)

creating a file including a translation of at least one said localizable string (separating country or regional content from the structure of the document into a separate file, where that file can be updated, col. 7, lines 12-18);

wherein said translation includes a user-supplied translation (creating user-defined term databases, where the user is able to supply the translations to be used, col. 28, lines 24-34 and 63-67 and col. 29, lines 1-30);

creating a second file including non-localized data from said document (separating out the country or regional content into a separate file, leaving the other content in a separate file, col. 7, lines 12-18); and

merging said first file and said second file (finding the correct localization file, and putting the files back together, col. 7, lines 18-20).

As to claims 28, and 35, Lakritz teaches:

identify at least one token within said document (col. 7, lines 27-29);

identify a localizable string within said token (col. 7, lines 27-29);

prompting a user for confirmation of said identifying a localizable string (creating user-defined term databases, where the user is prompted to supply a translation for each language to be used, col. 28, lines 24-34 and 63-67 and col. 29, lines 1-30);

extract said localizable string from said document (separating country or regional content from the structure of the document into a separate file, where that file can be updated, col. 7, lines 12-18);

translate at least one said extracted localizable string (supplying a translation, col. 7, lines 36-40);

extracting non-localizable string from said document (separating out the country or regional content into a separate file, leaving the other content in a separate file, col. 7, lines 12-18); and

merging said extracted non-localizable data with at least one of said translated extracted localizable string and said extracted localizable string (finding the correct localization file, and putting the files back together, col. 7, lines 18-20).

As to claim 42, Lakritz teaches:

a processor (a computer, col. 3, lines 25, which would necessarily include a processor);

a memory storing program instructions (a computer with applications, col. 3, lines 25, which would necessarily include a memory);

identify at least one token within said document (col. 7, lines 27-29);

identify a localizable string within said token (col. 7, lines 27-29);

prompt a user for confirmation of said identifying a localizable string (creating user-defined term databases, where the user is prompted to supply a translation for each language to be used, col. 28, lines 24-34 and 63-67 and col. 29, lines 1-30);

extract said localizable string from said document (separating country or regional content from the structure of the document into a separate file, where that file can be updated, col. 7, lines 12-18);

translate at least one said extracted localizable string (supplying a translation, col. 7, lines 36-40);

extracting non-localizable string from said document (separating out the country or regional content into a separate file, leaving the other content in a separate file, col. 7, lines 12-18); and

merging said extracted non-localizable data with at least one of said translated extracted localizable string and said extracted localizable string (finding the correct localization file, and putting the files back together, col. 7, lines 18-20).

As to claims 2, 11, and 20, Lakritz teaches prompting a user for confirmation of said identifying at least one localizable string (users are allowed to edit the information, col. 8, lines 53-56, further creating user-defined term databases, where the user is prompted to supply a translation for each language to be used, col. 28, lines 24-34 and 63-67 and col. 29, lines 1-30).

As to claims 3, 12 and 21, Lakritz teaches creating a third file including at least one said localizable string (creating a separate file for each of the country or regions for the content to be translated into (col. 7, lines 12-18), which would necessary include creating a third or more file).

As to claims 4, 13 and 22, Lakritz teaches merging includes merging said third file (merging the files based on the needed translation (col. 7, lines 12-18, and 27-40), where it would be necessary that if the information from the third file was needed, that information would be merged).

As to claims 5, 14, 23, 30, 37 and 44, Lakritz teaches editing said first file to provide said user-supplied translation (creating user-defined term databases, where the user is prompted to supply a translation for each language to be used, the user is able to add, delete or insert translations, col. 28, lines 24-34 and 63-67 and col. 29, lines 1-30).

As to claims 6, 15, 24, 31, 38, and 45, Lakritz teaches merging further includes recording said user-supplied translation within said first file into a dictionary module (saving the visitors translations for a later use, col. 8, lines 53-60).

As to claims 8, 17, 26, 33, 40 and 47, Lakritz teaches screening a string of characters with said document whether said string of characters is at least one of

Art Unit: 2654

bounded and unbounded (finding a string to be translated that is bounded by the tags, col. 7, line 35).

As to claims 9, 18, 27, 34, 41 and 48, Lakritz teaches said localizable string includes at least one of data and executable code (a string in text, col. 7, lines 35-36).

As to claims 32, 39, and 46, Lakritz teaches one of a dictionary translation and a user-supplied translation (using a dictionary translation and a user supplied translation, col. 7, lines 45, and col. 8, lines 53-56, creating user-defined term databases, where the user is prompted to supply a translation for each language to be used, col. 28, lines 24-34 and 63-67 and col. 29, lines 1-30).

Conclusion

6. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

Art Unit: 2654

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thomas E. Shortledge whose telephone number is (571)272-7612. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:00 - 4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Richemond Dorvil can be reached on (571)272-7602. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


RICHEMOND DORVIL
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

TS
2/16/2006